

Fall 9-12-1984

Senate Meeting September 12, 1984

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting September 12, 1984" (1984). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 407.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/407>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(not approved by the Academic Senate)

September 12, 1984

Volume XVI, No. 2

CONTENTS

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of August 29, 1984

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Action Item: Rules Committee Recommendation
Faculty Elections Committee: Philip Buriak, CAST

Information Item: Motion XVI-4 of 8/29/84 on Market Equity Adjustments

Committee Reports

Communications

Adjournment

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(not approved by the Academic Senate)

September 12, 1984

Volume XVI, No. 2

Call to Order

Chairperson Gowdy called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Roll Call

Secretary Sessions called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Approval of the Minutes of July 18, 1984

Corrections to the minutes were offered.

Mr. Eimermann: Page 14, third paragraph should read: "Dr. Watkin's example of a bootstrap effort was not from salary increase money, but from SAS appropriations."

Last sentence should read: "When the Board of Regents approved at a preliminary budget approval stage a market equity adjustment, it was on top of a 15% raise."

Mr. Eimermann also suggested that for consistency, senators should be referred to only as Mr. or Ms. or perhaps Senator.

Mr. Strand had several corrections: Page 3, beginning seventh line of last paragraph, should read: "As Assistant to the Provost; Richard Dammers, Professor of English, is on special assignment in the Provost's Office to assist with the preparation of North Central Association documents. (3) Religious Observances, and (4) State of the University address. Strand also commented that the NCA will be on campus February 20-22, 1985 and summarized a report on Admissions Requirements for Public Universities by the Board of Higher Education. Dr. Jeff Chinn chaired a committee which prepared a report for ISU on the topic. The two BHE recommendations which some are concerned about are: 'The Board of Higher Education recommends that all public universities consider for adoption the following high school subjects as a minimum admission requirement: four years of English; three years of Social Science; three years of Mathematics; three years of laboratory sciences; and two years of electives in foreign languages, music or art.' The startling aspect of this recommendation is that it is a one-size-fits-all recommendation for all public universities in Illinois. Apparently Board members did not feel that public universities were going far enough with the analysis of admission requirements. The proposal raises questions about whether all schools can deliver this type of curriculum to all its students. These and other questions will be discussed at the Board of Higher Education meeting next week at Eastern Illinois University.

Page 4, paragraph 2, line 3: Strike quotation mark. Line 11, insert quotation mark after admittance. Line 13, sentence should read: "Others

will need special admission consideration. Requiring common standards of all who seek admission to a public university could create problems all over the state. For example, if a student is not admitted, he could call his state representative to lean on the institution for admittance; all sorts of political maneuverings could be forthcoming. We have received the recommendations and such BHE staff recommendations are usually endorsed. We shall wait and see if and when they take effect. We will be reading and hearing more about this topic later."

Paragraph 5, last sentence: "Strand said that, working with the URC representatives on this process, they had tried to come up with a sum that best fits the formula defined on page 2 of the proposal and arrived at \$82,000."

Last Paragraph, last Sentence: "But because of resignations, less than the full amount of money was available."

Page 5, paragraph 8, line 3: Jack Chizmar completed the study.

Page 6, paragraph 1: "The Board of Regents reopened the question of funding. . ."

Paragraph 2, sentence 3: Begin sentence: "The amount was included . . . in the money Dr. Harden cited and was taken off the top of personal services money.

Paragraph 4, last sentence: "Strand added that some labor contracts were finalized at less."

Page 7, last paragraph: Instances where "the committee" should be used: "The committee unanimously recommended that the source of funds be from new money rather than from reallocations of existing funds. . . . The committee unanimously recommended everything except the amount of money. . . . The committee recommended that a two-stage procedure be used. . . . The committee recommended that the money be spread as widely as was feasible, rather than seeking out super stars in each college and giving them the benefit of the funds."

Page 8, paragraph 2, sentence 3: "The middle ground consensus was the figure of \$170,000, which was given to the Provost as the best estimate."

Paragraph 2, next to the last line: "that was the type of institution to which the University was losing faculty members. He asked Deans to poll their Chairs about where faculty were going after resigning."

Paragraph 3, line 6: "regression analysis statistics."

Page 8, second paragraph from bottom: "Strand said that in preparation for the actual implementation of the plan or the allocation of the funds. . . ."

Last paragraph, line 4: Strike: "as you bring together these figures."

Second line from bottom: "This year we said that, but if the Deans wished to do so, they could utilize these funds to help additional. . . ."

Page 9, sentence 1: Strike the word "to" before "get" and strike the words "into the" before "market." The line would then read: "Faculty members get market equity adjustments or supplement funds for those who had a small amount of the \$170,000."

Page 10, paragraph 6, line 2: ". . . they would not get one cent of that money through the regression analysis."

Paragraph 9, sentence 2: "Strand replied, no plans at this time, but he would not foreclose this option."

Last paragraph: "Dr. Mohr had conceptual problems. . . ."

Mr. Mohr's correction: page 5, paragraph 9, sentence 2: "One of the members of the Board of Regents suggested an additional \$500,000 to be divided by all three regency universities. The legislature approved a 5% increase."

Mr. Gamsky's correction: page 12, paragraph 5, sentence 4: "Gamsky replied that a specific number had not yet been determined."

Mr. Marchio's correction: page 13, Communications: The words "and protection of student rights" should be added.

Mr. Tarulis's correction: His name had been omitted from the roll.

Mr. Eimermann said the minutes may not be clear in the original as corrected in later minutes. There should be at least one corrected copy in the Senate office.

XVI-6 Motion by Christian (Second, Mohr) to accept the minutes as corrected.

Chairperson's Remarks

Ms. Gowdy offered an apology for the situation which occurred with the motion that was passed and later declared out of order. The action did not follow Senate bylaws for promulgation and discussion.

She observed that her work experience has been in a hierarchichal structure. An approach to problems which is acceptable from that background may not seem acceptable to those who have spent their work experience in a departmental, collegial atmosphere. Senators who fit into that pattern will need to keep a close eye out. The more Senators can find to agree upon, the better off the Senate will be. There is a need for objective discussion. A lot of recent discussion has been subjective.

Ms. Gowdy called attention to Communications Item 1 in the Executive Committee Minutes (September 5, 1984), a letter from Academic Affairs Committee (2.10.84.1) asking if the Academic Plan might be handled more expeditiously. Ordinarily, Senate would be starting on it at this meeting or the next, continuing through the semester. By contrast this semester, the Academic Plan will be presented for discussion November 14, 28, and December 12.

Senators who have not turned in their address forms to the Senate Office, please do so tonight.

The external committee structure is already out of date, but the Rules Committee is working hard to fill vacancies. Please inform the Academic Senate Office of errors.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Christian announced that the deadline for applications for external Senate committees would be extended to September 17th due to the small number of applicants. He asked the assistance of all senators to announce that applications for committee positions are in Hovey 301.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Christian gave the report. Mr. Charnogorsky was serving on the GTE consumers' panel in Indianapolis, Indiana. The voter registration drive is about to start. SBBBD has received help from NAACP, College Democrats, and other campus organizations in staffing this tremendous project. A conservative goal of 2,000 students registered has been set.

At last week's SBBBD meeting, the Board unanimously approved the resolution condemning the mass gathering ordinance and the ban on keg sales and transportation after 10:00 p.m. Mr. Charnogorsky would be addressing the city council next week to ask that the keg ban be lifted. The ad campaign was working. The number of student arrests was down. Many of the last weekend's arrests were students from SIU or others in town for the weekend. The party patrol success rate is about 85%. No follow-up complaints were filed. SBBBD cleaned up the streets Sunday morning. The money earned from this will be given to the McLean County Humane Society.

Administrators' Remarks

President Watkins spoke. During the past few weeks, he had distributed information in various ways. The budget review was put into faculty-staff mail boxes on September 7th. It detailed the budget for the current fiscal year and the Board of Regents' request. This proposed budget will leave the BOR in good shape, but then it faces the BHE staff where paring back is done. ISU has received excellent support from the Chancellor's Office in terms of NEPRs and SASSs. Together the two amount to \$4 million dollars. The advice on the news this evening, "Don't spend the money yet," was very good advice. New programs include the doctorate in school psychology, the bachelor's and master's degree in writing, and the baccalaureate in international business.

Summarized in the ISU Report were the results of the IBHE meeting of last week. BHE recommended an explicit and strong set of requirements for admission to state universities. The time line would be 1990. That sounds a long way off, but it is only five years.

The BHE was really enthusiastic about our staff report on this. No one on the BHE except Dr. Wellbank raised any questions about it. The student member of the board endorsed it heartily. The member of the student advisory committee did not endorse it entirely, but the only change he suggested was that the two years of electives in foreign language or art be changed to two years of foreign language.

It is clear that the BHE staff is not satisfied with preliminary responses of the state universities on July 1, 1984. Clearly, the staff of the BHE is in favor of keeping the universities' feet to the fire on this issue: they have the right to set requirements. There will be additional discussion about this, as executives of most state institutions wish to meet. Executive Director Wagner is going to have a discussion on the consequences.

It is Watkins' estimation that the recommendation will pass the BHE as an Action Item in October and that the boards of the various systems will be expected to give it serious consideration. The work of the committees that put together the proposal--which you have not seen--is far from done. ISU will have to alter where it is and come in with additional admission requirements for the Board of Higher Education. Otherwise, these will be set by the BHE.

They made it clear that they will be doing hard reviews, quantitative and qualitative, of the doctoral programs. The BHE does not have the authority to eliminate a program, but could eliminate funding. Those are questions that remain to be seen. There will be a much harder look at our programs, our proposals for doctorates, and a close look at program reviews.

The State of the University address was given yesterday. The new Chancellor William Monat was present. It is in printed form and has been distributed to the university community. One point that was not reported in the paper was that there is a real concern about the legitimacy of the ASPT system. It tends to be a one-size-fits-all system. There never has been a substantial review of the system: it is essentially still the same as it always was. It has been used in such a way that the merit awards are nill in many departments and that, in most departments, 70% of the decisions are not made on merit.

Mr. Pritner objected that the area media report what the Board of Regents recommends as a salary increase and communicate the impression that the recommendation is what the university receives. A good percentage of the people in the community actually believe that. In the university community that is denied; outside the university community, he suggested, most people think that is the raise received. If he had received the raises reported since 1966, when he came to ISU, he would be making about three times his present salary as a full professor at ISU. The President of the University should qualify these early statements in some way, because most of the time the actual amounts are about one-fourth what the Board of Regents recommends. They are acting responsibly in recommending this, but the reality is far different from the recommendation. This reality should be articulated to the press by the administration of the University. This community does not know the differential between recommendations and what is actually received.

Mr. Watkins responded that he had articulated this to the press. Mr. Pritner stated that, if people feel deans or department heads are acting irresponsibly, they will be replaced.

Mr. Watkins said that under the ASPT system, the Dean has one vote toward raises. He did not see how firing the dean or department chair could solve anything. Mr. Pritner had spent years as department chair and should know how the system works. The ASPT system takes decisions out of the hands of deans and department heads.

Mr. Pritner did not think decisions had been taken out of their hands. He thought the administration held the cards about who is running the program.

Mr. Eimermann remarked about the ASPT system. He thought that the largest problem was not with the system itself, but with the amount of money put into the system. If the salary increases from the state legislature were equal to or above the cost of living, we would not have problems. Secondly, recommendations of CFSC and DFSC are recommendations to the Provost, which he has power to accept or reject. He has the impression that the CFSC had to approve the criteria which the departments put forth. It seems to him that the number of departments abusing the system is small. There is a resolution for that problem within the system without having to tinker with the entire system. If the department is putting in 70% of its faculty as being exceptional and then only giving 10% to those 70%, then a dean who simply announces that he is demanding more proof that those people are exceptional and draws the light of public attention to that department, may not get results. When that occurs, he would be happy to support Dr. Watkins' demands for changes in the system. Otherwise, he would support Senator Pritner's views that other things can be done. There are some additional leverage pressures that would be forthcoming which do not call for recasting the entire system.

Mr. Eimermann had some additional questions.

He understood that in the current Board report there would be a change of title and assignment for Dave Wiant. Mr. Watkins replied that it was a change of title only. The change in assignment was that he had taken on increased duties in regard to collective bargaining.

Mr. Eimermann inquired what standards determine when a nationwide affirmative action search is required for a position as opposed to when a person is simply reassigned within an administrative structure to new duties or changed job titles. Mr. Watkins said it was to a matter of degree as to when the Affirmative Action officers decided a search was needed. In a case like this, where an individual has served the university for a number of years, and has extended himself to take care of another area at no extra salary, that is simply added to his title. If the question were the creation of a new position, or a person who retires or resigns, then, depending on the nature of the position, probably a national search would be needed. There is no need for an outside search when the position is already filled. There are succinct guidelines for Affirmative Action searches.

Mr. Eimermann questioned Dr. Harden about the budget process. At this point the Board of Regents has put forth a recommendation which goes on to the BHE, etc. which involves a 13.5% salary increase. Harden agreed. Is that for all personnel, civil service personnel only, faculty only, tenure track only, administrative/professional persons? The Board of Regents cites statistics about faculty, showing how they have fallen behind in the market. What about the other categories of people. Is this just a pot of money that comes to the University? Who determines how this money is distributed? At what point are these critical decisions made?

Mr. Watkins answered that the 13.5% the BOR set forth will be an increase over the current year's personal budget (all of it). The only other input that the Board itself makes is guidelines that prevent adding other monies such as from contractual dollars, etc. Temporary faculty are not in that group: they are hired new each year. What generally is done is to take monies off the top that the Provost feels are needed for various kinds of adjustments. This is permissible in ASPT system. Then the CFSCs and DFSCs are given an amount that the Provost determines ought to be allocated through the ASPT system.

What Provost Strand did vis-a-vis Market Equity is perfectly justified in the system now. Generally speaking, not a great deal of money is used in those ways. Amounts that go to Civil Service and A/P areas are determined by personal services monies we are now receiving. A few years ago the university had to phase out a certain amount of dollars from the Personal Service funds. If the proportions of monies begin to change, the other proportions can be changed. If for example the percentage of money that goes to faculty people does increase, more faculty may be hired and fewer secretaries or buildings and grounds workers, etc.

Mr. Harden said there had never been money for any specific group in personal services, except for NEPR and SAS appropriations, and the bootstrap allocation of \$250,000 for faculty in 1973-1974. This year is different in that this 13.5% is of a 100% base. And, as the President said, specified guidelines made temporary faculty not eligible.

Mr. Watkins said that sometimes the Board of Regents staff has proposed and the BHE has accepted a cap on the overall average. That is designed to check any rivalry between ISU and other schools to get another one-half per cent, or so.

Mr. Harden said a check in the Executive Director's Report comparing civil service staff salaries with personnel in Springfield shows ISU civil service deficiencies.

Mr. Eimermann said Board of Regent meetings document how far behind the faculty are. When it comes to distributing of funds, it seems to be distributed equally. How much flexibility does ISU have as an institution as to the split among temporary, tenure/track, civil service, etc.

Mr. Harden said that once the figure had been arrived at (5%) generally what drives the system is the dollar amount (\$10.3 million, or whatever, for personal services). The ASPT process drives the faculty salary process. Early in the year my office generates all the regular faculty members by departments and their base salaries. Raise money is then generated on that basis.

Mr. Watkins said it would not be correct to assume that BOR members are unconcerned if money is pulled away from civil service and given to faculty. They do have studies of faculty salaries and civil service deficiencies, institution by institution. ISU is a little better off than NIU, but behind salaries in Springfield. Comparing secretary to secretary, etc., ISU lags behind rather badly. The real problem is a need to compare each area where ISU is not competitive at all. A number of Civil Service areas now have collective bargaining.

Mr. Luther defended his department's method of distribution. Raises are less than cost of living increase. Given the small amount allowed for merit, only allow one or two people in the department to receive exceptional merit. Full Professors did not receive the same salary increment that Associate Professors received.

Mr. Watkins said the system is not concerned with reward of merit.

Mr. Luther felt that three members in his department can make merit and salary decisions better than an administrator.

Mr. Watkins said that department chairs should have some funds to use at their discretion.

Mr. Luther said that, having sat on appeals committees, he believes members of departments should make decisions. He does not think people in administration should make decisions.

Mr. Schmaltz asked, if there is tremendous unhappiness about ASPT, where is the dissent? His department decides how many persons will receive exceptional merit, and the majority of the faculty is pleased with this process. When the proposal came through to restrict the number put in for exceptional merit to 40%, department chairs were in with 80%, all exceptional. Where is the pressure to change the system coming from?

Mr. Watkins said the ISU system does not reward some of the best people. It is a weak-dean system. A dean has no power.

Recess: 8:30 to 8:45 p.m.

Mr. Lorber commented that at the last meeting, the Senate told the Provost in the form of a motion that he could not do certain things in respect to salaries without the consent of the faculty through committees. At this meeting, the Senate is in a sense over-ruling that fact because of the comments criticizing administrator weaknesses in the ASPT process. He did not see how it could be both ways. The less power given away, the more say so faculty have over their own affairs. The fact that the administration goes along with faculty is all very good. Anything done to promote cooperation is better.

Mr. Spence thought the ASPT system was overly rigid. He had spoken with Mr. Watkins over recess and thought it would be an improvement in the system to reserve a certain percentage of money for use by the chair. It is not justified to say that a department is abusing the ASPT system just because it places a certain percentage of its faculty in the exceptional merit category. The Math Department has a well-thought-out plan which entails the distribution of salary increment monies over a long period of time. This has often resulted in a fairly high percentage of the faculty being named for exceptional merit in any one given year. The system was devised in response to a very rigid ASPT system.

Mr. Watkins responded that the discussion had been very constructive. He hoped that changes could be effected in the ASPT system that would benefit departments as well as faculty members. There is need to allow a department chairperson discretion to have say so in the system. Perhaps a small percentage of the salary increment money could be withheld. Then go to the department and tell the department chair to distribute 95% of salary money as he would, according to the ASPT process. But, an amount of money has been reserved for all department chairs for critical areas of salary needs. Then chairs would again begin to feel that they were heading a department.

Mr. Strand, continuing administrators' remarks, said that several things had occurred since the last meeting. A newsletter was sent out September 7 with an explanation of the Market Equity process. Last Monday he met with the ad hoc committee which had assisted in making decisions on the part of Market Equity process. They had an informative and congenial session. As a result of that meeting, the handout (TABLE I - TOTAL DOLLARS BY COLLEGE; TABLE II - DISTRIBUTION OF \$170,000; AND TABLE III - DISTRIBUTION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS) placed before the Senate this evening was printed.

With regard to the Academic Planning Process, the Senate will not act on all sections of the plan. It is not necessary for the Senate to rehash what the committee did. Academic Affairs Committee chairperson, Margaret Balbach, and former chairperson of the Senate, Robert Ritt, would serve on the committee.

Mr. Mohr asked about the Tables. The distribution of the \$170,000 was listed first. Did the same individuals receive funds from both sources. Mr. Strand said approximately twenty individuals received money from both sources.

Ms. Getsi asked about a rumor that some A/P people got market adjustments on top of a 12-month contract. Mr. Strand said four people (A/P) received increments through the Provost's office and those individuals received somewhere in the neighborhood of 7%. This was more a salary-minima type of action. Two college deans, one program director, and a person in the Provost's office received these funds.

Ms. Getsi asked what the mean raise for tenure/track faculty is. Mr. Strand answered that each group as a total received 7.5% average.

Mr. Pritner addressed Mr. Strand: Does he think what happened should have happened? Mr. Strand replied, yes. A market equity process should have been undertaken.

Mr. Pritner asked if raises go to the people who should have gotten the raise? Was this consistent with merit? Based on what he had heard, from deans and department chairs, yes, the money went where it was needed.

Mr. Petrossian asked about the \$60/month amount. Was this a lump sum? Was it a monthly salary income increase? Was that decision made in conjunction with the head of the department and the dean?

Mr. Strand answered yes. Salary data was given to deans, reviewed with chairs, then given back to deans and then to the Provost.

Mr. Eimermann: What was the average salary increase for temporary faculty members? Mr. Strand said they do not get a yearly increase. Temporary faculty members are hired for a specific responsibility.

Mr. Eimermann commented: Permanent temporary faculty, who teach year after year; no increase for those people? Mr. Strand answered, correct.

Mr. Eimermann: Where would the majority of dollars go? Since the temporary faculty help generate the salary pool, where does the money go? Mr. Strand answered, to tenure track faculty. There was no directive or mandate as to money to be distributed to temporary faculty.

Mr. Pontius inquired why the Arena plans were not put through the Facilities Planning Committee of the University. Dr. Harden replied that the Facilities Planning Committee deals with appropriated funds. The arena would be built with bond revenue funds and donations.

Mr. Harden and Mr. Gamsky had no administrators' remarks.

Rules Committee Recommendation

XVI-7

(Senate agreed by 2/3 vote to go ahead with the motion).

Mr. Pontius moved (Second, Christian) that Philip Buriak of the Agriculture Department be elected the CAST representative to the Faculty Elections Committee. Motion passed on a voice vote.

Information Item

XVI-8

Ms. Getsi moved to act tonight on motion XVI-4 (Page 14 of 8/29/84 Minutes) (Second, Eimermann).

Discussion followed (Schmaltz, Gowdy, Mohr) on whether Faculty Affairs Committee should present this motion to the floor. Mr. Strand did not find the motion appropriate. He would vote against it. Mr. Eimermann and Mr. Schmaltz argued for it.

Roll call vote whether to move motion to action stage. Passed.

The Senate considered the following motion: (XVI-4, Page 14 of 8/29/84 Minutes):

XVI-4 Ms. Getsi moved the following:

"That the Faculty Affairs Committee, in conjunction with the University Review Committee, immediately begin to develop policy and procedures governing any future Market or Salary Minima Adjustments of faculty salaries; that these procedures be approved by the Academic Senate; and that no further Market or Salary Minima Adjustments take place until the policy is in place." (Second, Schmaltz)

Mr. Strand said the motion reverses the process of URC.

Mr. Mohr will vote for the motion. There has been a great deal of talk about inflexibility in the ASPT process. This was an opportunity to change from that process, in favor of allowing administrative input in some circumstances. There is need to review. He thought there is need to define the meaning of market adjustment and marketability. Also, there is need for money for exceptional merit: Money for Nobel prize winners, of which ISU has none. There is need to define where funds will come from. Procedures are needed. Does merit have anything to do with market? Market has to do with average income. There is need to lift the whole salary structure and to not distribute the whole to a limited part of the structure. ISU is a fine university, but it could be better.

Mr. Lorber was all for shared governance, but he felt we could not tell the Provost what to do. He would like to make motion into a request.

Mr. Eimermann said this had great significance for the shared governance system. Shared governance system is advisory to the President. All votes on motions in the Senate pass on to the President. He may accept, or reject the advice. If he thinks it destructive, he will reject it. Over the years, the faculty has developed the ASPT document, which gives the procedures and criteria to determine salaries. The administration accepted that document and that system. This spring, however, the administration acted outside the scope of that document. He felt that Mr. Strand had taken his explanation from the ASPT document out of context.

Mr. Eimermann desired to bring market equity within the ASPT system by bringing the matter to the URC and developing set procedures. He was shocked that we had a confrontation here. Does Mr. Strand object to taking it to the URC or to the Senate?

Mr. Strand cited Page 13 of the ASPT document, Section X. A. 1. It allows the Provost to take money off the top and have it allocated outside the ASPT process. His experiences with the URC were that anything of substance takes about two years to move through the URC. There is a contradiction there.

Mr. Watkins said this would in fact reduce the flexibility of the ASPT system. The need is to increase flexibility. As a result, he opposed the motion.

Mr. Schmaltz asked why there was an attempt to go through the URC and Faculty Affairs Committee and the ASPT process to get market equity in place, but now no need for these committees to implement it. If it were appropriate eight months ago, why not now? What changed?

Mr. Strand said that, in the spirit of collegiality, there was an attempt to go through traditional policies. Market Equity was not endorsed by the Senate. At that point, the administrator's prerogative was taken. He would not bow to a system that would professionally be inappropriate.

Mr. Eimermann felt that the Senate was expressing its will. Does the Senate approve of the Provost going outside the document in order to have Market Equity adjustments, or does it wish to go on the record wishing to have the Market Equity adjustments within the ASPT guidelines?

Ms. Getsi said there had been unhappiness at a breakdown in communication. She thought that putting a standing committee of the Senate in active involvement in this process could avert that in the future. The issues were very complicated for many new Senators just coming onto the Senate.

Mr. Christian sought to understand what the issue was. As he saw it, Mr. Strand said it lies with Ms. Getsi's and Mr. Eimermann's interpretation that Mr. Strand goes beyond his bounds. Is the question whether or not to limit the power of Mr. Strand?

Mr. Eimermann assented that Mr. Strand has the power to go outside the system, but the sense of the Senate is that he should operate within the system for market equity.

Mr. Strand said deans and department chairs come to him and say system is too restrictive to allow market equity to move in an effective way within the system. Therefore, it should be processed outside of the system.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked if there aren't policies and procedures for market equity already? He thought it would facilitate departmental planning. He questioned the length of time to get things through the URC, up to two years. If Senate works with them, they should take less time.

Mr. Schmaltz thought that the faculty wants some say in how the market equity procedure works. In the system that was used, one could question whether market equity was addressed. Money could have gone to others than those who were supposed to get it. Faculty wants input in procedures. If a faculty member approaches his dean and says, "I have another job offer," he doesn't want the answer, "That's a great offer, you should take it." Faculty would like input into procedures to determine whether they want it, and the amount of money.

Mr. Piland said old faculty members have lower salaries. There is no equity for them. In his experience, the ASPT process is a joke. One person had received \$4 per week increase for exceptional merit. He could see some good results from market equity.

Mr. Christian asked Mr. Strand if he thought the faculty had input?

Mr. Strand answered, yes. The ad hoc committee had voice in stages of the process.

Mr. Eimermann thought whatever procedures were developed should be within the ASPT document, and that the Senate should approve them.

XVI-9 Mr. Parr moved to separate the motion (Second, Eimermann).
Motion carried on a voice vote.

The separated motion then read:

XVI-9 "That the Faculty Affairs Committee, in conjunction with the University Review Committee, immediately begin to develop policy and procedures governing any future Market or Salary Minima Adjustments of faculty salaries; that these procedures be approved by the Academic Senate."

XVI-10 "The Senate requests that no further Market or Salary Minima Adjustments take place until the policy is in place."

Mr. Lorber supported the first part of the motion.

XVI-11 Mr. Gamsky moved that the clause, "That these procedures be approved by the Academic Senate," be deleted. (Second, Pritner).

Senator Getsi was amenable to changing the motion to: "be acted upon by the Senate." Point of order that she could not do this.

Mr. Mohr was against the motion to amend.

Call for the question on amendment.

XVI-11 Motion to delete the clause, "that these procedures be approved by the Academic Senate" (Gamsky, Pritner) The amendment passed (20 yes, 11 no).

XVI-12 Mr. Rosenbaum moved (Second, Spence) to add: "that they be submitted to the Senate for consideration and that, if approved, they be added to the ASPT document." Call for question. Motion carried on a voice vote.

XVI-9 Vote on the main motion as amended. (Part I of Separated Motion)
Motion carried on a voice vote.

Mohr called for the question on the second part of the split motion:

XVI-10 "The Senate requests that no further Market or Salary Minima Adjustments take place until the policy is approved." (It was to be noted that this was to be identified with the first motion, if it passed.)
The second part of the split motion was defeated (14 yes, 17 no).

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs. No report.

Administrative Affairs. Mr. McCracken had reported that they will be working on the calendar.

Budget Committee. No report.

Faculty Affairs Committee. Mr. Schmaltz reported that the committee will be meeting next week.

Rules Committee. Committee will meet for a few minutes following Senate meeting.

Student Affairs Committee. Met previous to last Senate meeting. Minutes should reflect action on the Athletic Policy. Committee will meet again September 26, 1984, 6:30 p.m., Circus Room, Bone Student Center.

Communications

Ms. Gowdy announced that the Panel of Ten election will take place at the Senate Meeting on September 26, 1984.

XVI-13

Mr. Christian moved that the Senate adjourn (Second, Sessions). Motion passed on a voice vote.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

KYLE SESSIONS, SECRETARY

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	VOTE							VOICE VOTE		
		Motion # XVI8	Motion # XVII10	Motion # XVIII11	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion No.	Y	N
BALBACH	(excused)								XVI-6	X	
BEDINGFIELD	P								XVI-7	X	
BELKNAP	P	NO	NO	YES					XVI-8	X	
BOWEN	P	YES	NO	YES					XVI-4		
CHARNOGORSKY	(excused)										
CHRISTIAN	P	YES	NO	NO					XVI-9	X	
DORE	absent								XVI-10		X
EIMERMANN	P	YES	YES	NO					XVI-11	X	
FORD	absent								XVI-12	X	
GAMSKY	P	NO	NO	YES					XVI-13	X	
GETSI	P	YES	YES	NO							
GORDON	P	YES	YES	YES							
GOWDY	P	NO	NO	YES							
GROVE	absent										
HANLON	P	YES	YES	YES							
HARDEN	P	NO	NO	YES							
LANDFAIR	P										
LORBER	P	NO	NO	YES							
LUTHER	P	YES	YES	YES							
MARCHIO	P										
MASON	P										
MAYHORN	P										
MCCRACKEN	P										
MOHR	P	YES	YES	NO							
MULCAHY	(excused)										
NELSEN	P	YES	YES	YES							
PARKE	P	NO	NO	YES							
PARR	P	PRESENT	NO	YES							
PETROSSIAN	P	YES	NO	NO							
PILAND	P	NO	NO	YES							
PONTIUS	P	YES	NO	NO							
PRITNER	P	YES	YES	YES							
ROSENBAUM	P	YES	YES	YES							
SCHMALTZ	P	YES	YES	NO							
SESSIONS	P	YES	NO	YES							
SPENCE	P	YES	YES	NO							
SPENCER	P	YES	YES	NO							
STOKES	P	YES	YES	YES							
D. STRAND	P	NO	NO	YES							
K. STRAND	P	NO	NO	NO							
TALLEY	P										
TARULIS	P										
TAYLOR	P	YES	NO	YES							
TOWNSEND	P										
WATKINS	P	NO	NO	YES							
WHIPPLE	absent										
WHITCOMB	P	NO	YES	NO							
ZEIDENSTEIN	(excused)										
		20 YES	14 YES	20 YES							
		11 NO	17 NO	11 NO							

*MANY STUDENTS LEFT BEFORE THE VOTING TOOK PLACE.